



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/650,299

08/27/2003

Robert C. Hansen

POU920030123US1

6669

46429

7590

08/11/2008

CANTOR COLBURN LLP-IBM POUGHKEEPSIE

20 Church Street

22nd Floor

Hartford, CT 06103

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on April 28, 2008.

Claims 2-3, 8-9, and 14-15 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 6, and 15 have been amended.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-18 are pending in this application.

Examiner's Note

The Examiner would like to note that the present application has been reassigned to a new Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 6, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims contain two different steps occurring when the same limitation is met, (1) reconfiguring the container and (2) generating an error message. The specification of this application teaches that the error message is generated when the reconfiguration of the container is not possible. It is unclear from the claims in light of the specification if the if both the reconfiguring and error message occurs, if one happens or the other, or if the error message is generated after the reconfiguring occurs.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radhakrishnan (7284054) in view of OGSI (an article entitled "Open Grid Services Infrastructure (OGSI)"- Version 1.0) dated June 27, 2003.

Regarding claims 1, 7, and 13, Radhakrishnan teaches a method for managing open grid service architecture (OGSA) services comprising:

establishing an instance including an container (Col 13, line 54 – Col. 14, line 30);

establishing an service and an service descriptor (Col. 13, lines 54 – 58) including an container attribute needed for said service (Col. 16, lines 31 - 43);

deploying said service to said instance (Col 16, lines 38 – 43);

comparing said container attribute to a characteristic of said container;

supporting said service on said container when said attribute matches said characteristic;

reconfiguring said container when said attribute does not match said characteristic to support said service;

generating an error message when said attribute does not match said characteristic (Col. 17, line 61 – Col. 18, line 26; where container rules are the container characteristics. The container rules are compared with the service attributes and services statistics to determine whether the service operating according to the rules. If the rules are being violated (or triggered) the CAE then performs reconfiguration of the infrastructure including which containers and services are running on what servers. The event messages (error messages) are triggered when a rule is being violated. See Col. 17, lines 30 – 52).

Radhakrishnan does not explicitly indicate that the services and instances are OGSA/OGSI services.

OGSI teaches that OGSI, Grid services are an extension of web services.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use OGSI's teaching of Grid services in Radhakrishnan's teaching to provide the benefits of Grid services (enchanced services for distributed applications) while maintaining the configurability and structured rules of Radhakrishnan.

Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radhakrishnan in view of OGSI, and further in view of Java (Article entitled "Java Programmer's Guide").

Regarding claims 4, 10, and 16, Radhakrishnan does not explicitly teach the claimed feature of "providing a user interface for managing OGSI instances, said user interface providing a tool for creating an OGSI instance for supporting OGSA services".

However, Java teaches some additional APIs and features provided by a framework for more advanced service developers (see the introduction of Java together with Part I1: Additional APIs). Specifically, Java discloses a GUI framework (see Java, Page 6, section 3.1 GUI client), wherein a test method of GUI client including "create an instance in the Factory panel" is provided (see Java, Page 6, step 3 to test your GUI client).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further combine the teachings of Java's with the cited references because teaching Java's would have allowed Radhakrishnan to provide some additional APIs and features for the more advanced service developers.

Regarding claims 5, 11, and 17, Radhakrishnan does not explicitly teach the claimed feature of "said creating said OGSI instance includes identifying a port of a grid resource to support said OGSI instance".

However, Java discloses that a service container API is provided to start embedded local hosting environments listening on particular ports (see Java, Page 14, section 10: Service Container). Additionally, Java further teaches that the NotificationSinkMan API (see Page 10, section 5 Notifications) makes use of this API to multiplex all sin URLs exposed over a single port(per transport).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further combine the teachings of Java's with the cited references because teaching Java's would have allowed OGSi's and Brown's to provide some additional APIs and features for the more advanced service developers.

Claims 6, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over over Radhakrishnan in view of OGSi, and further in view of Wilding-McBride (Book entitled "Java Development on PDAs: Building Applications for PocketPC and Palm Devices).

Regarding to claims 6, 12, and 18, Radhakrishnan does not explicitly teach the claimed feature of "providing a user interface for said deploying said OGSA service, said user interface including a tool for undeploying said OGSA service".

Wilding-McBride, however, teaches "To undeploy the web service, we again use the Axis administration client. The Ant build file defines a target to undeploy the image service, called UndeployImageService" (see Wilding- McBride, Page 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further combine the teachings of Wilding- McBride with the cited references because teaching Wilding-McBride's would have allowed OGSi's and Brown's to provide a method and a system to remove an existing web service to allow for new updates and newer services to appear on a host (see also Page 15).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7, and 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent Publication 2003/0101245 issued to Srinivasan because it teaches reconfiguring service in a web service environment which includes the limitation of creating an error message when the reconfiguring process does not succeed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN BATES whose telephone number is (571)272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin Bates/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2153